comparing the condition signature with the normal signature, and registering an event if the condition signature differs from the normal signature by more than a predetermined threshold. By this arrangement, it is more easily accessible to facilitate the acquisition and analysis of the condition indicators in the overall health of a system.

Simani, on the other hand, discloses an input-output sensor fault detection and isolation by using state estimation (Fig. 3). That is, each output sensor signal has an observer, and each observer produces a respective residual (page 185, section 5). Further, Simani discloses that the simulations are concerned with two aspects, namely the generation of pattern for the NN training in the fault diagnostic validation (page 185, section 6). In other words, the first aspect is the generation of patterns of these residual from training data which contains different fault signal conditions for one of the input sensor signals (M_f), and the second aspect is the training of a multi-layer perception neural network, which takes the residual as inputs and predicts the underlying fault signal condition.

However, the approach taken by Simani is not the same health monitoring method and system of Applicants' claimed invention. In particular, Simani fails to disclose constructing a condition signature from a plurality of condition indicators including a plurality of vibration measurements acquired from the system, as recited in claim 1. As described in Applicants' specification on page 3, lines 13-20, the term "signature", as used herein, for example, pertains to the values of a plurality of condition indicators that is merged or fused into a unit or quantity (i.e., set, vector or scalar). In contrast, Simani discloses a plurality of unmerged residuals from the respective observers, wherein each observer is linked to an individual sensor or condition indicator (Fig. 3). Accordingly, Simani fails to disclose constructing a condition signature from a plurality of condition indicators, as recited in claims 1 and 8, and similarly recited in claims 17 and 18.

-2-

For argument sake, even if Simani's unmerged residuals can be considered a condition signature, the residuals in Simani are never compared with other "normal" residuals. In fact, they are just used as inputs to the neural network. Further, Simani does not use thresholds to detect the faults. That is, the result of training Simani's neural network on data which contains different fault signal conditions is that the neural network can classify similar faults without recourse to such comparisons and thresholds. Accordingly, Simani fails to disclose or suggest the step of comparing the condition signature with the normal signature, as recited in claims 1, 8, 17 and 18.

Further, because Simani does not disclose or even suggest the concept of Applicants' condition signature, it cannot disclose or suggest the step of predicting a normal signature corresponding to a condition signature, as recited in claim 1, 8, 17 and 18. The Office Action alleges that page 183, section 2, first paragraph, and page 184, section 4, third paragraph in Simani, discloses the predicting step. However, it is respectfully submitted that Simani does not disclose a predicting step, but rather the equation for a discrete time, time-variant linear dynamic process, and only describes the type of classification performed by the neural network.

Further, the Office Action alleges, on page 183, section 3, third paragraph, and Fig. 3 in Simani, discloses constructing a condition signature from a plurality of vibration measurements. However, it is respectfully submitted that Simani fails to disclose or suggest that vibration measurements should be used as output sensor signals, and thus fails to disclose or even mention any vibration measurements.

Further, the Office Action alleges that on page 3, that on page 184, section 4, first paragraph in Simani, discloses the model is a learnt model comprising a neural network. However, it is respectfully submitted that the neural networks of Simani and the prior learnt model approach as taught in Applicants' claimed invention is completely different. In

-3-

particular, in the prior learnt model approach, as described on page 17, line 20-page 19, line

10 in Applicants' disclosure, the condition signature consists of two system measurements

(e.g., the change in amplitude at current phase and a change in phase at the same amplitude).

These measurements are also predicted by the output nodes of a neural network, which is a

static model of a normal engine system (e.g., there is an obvious error in the application at

page 18, lines 9-15, which one skilled in the art would immediately recognize and correct that

the input nodes of the neural network are mistakenly associated with the condition signature).

The predicted values from the neural networks are then compared with the actual

measurements on the basis of the prediction area. However, the neural networks in Simani

are merely used to classify the residuals which result from the operations. For example, in a

gas turbine example, Simani discloses that the engine system models which operate on single

data are state-space models. Thus, the neural networks found in Simani are completely

different from the prior learnt model approach as described in Applicants' claimed invention.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' claimed invention has the following

significant advantages over Simani. Firstly, Simani requires that the input and output sensors

must be distinguished between each other, whereas Applicants' invention discloses that the

signals from the input and/or output signals can be used to construct the condition signature,

which means there is no need to distinguish between the input and output sensors. Secondly,

Simani requires the provision of training data that contains the known fault conditions,

whereas Applicants' invention uses a model from which the normal signature can be

predicted. This is highly significant as it will be extremely onerous to provide training data to

cover all possible departures from the normality of a complicated system, such as a gas

turbine. Finally, Simani's device is limited to detecting only sensor faults, whereas

Applicants' invention can also respond to unexpected events or occurrences (e.g., abnormal

blade rubbing due to released lock plate, oil seal leak, or bind strike) in the system being

monitored.

-4-

Application No. 09/898,008

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Simani fails to disclose or render obvious the features recited in independent claims 1, 8, 17 and 18. Claims 2-7 and 9-16, which depend from the independent claims are likewise distinguished over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed as well as for the additional features they recite. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

COPY

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

David J. Cho
Registration No. 48,078

JAO:DJC/al

Attachments: Petition for Extension of Time
Letter to the Official Draftsperson

Date: February 3, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461

-5-